REMARKS

In view of the above amendments and the following remarks, reconsideration of the rejections contained in the Office Action of September 7, 2005 is respectfully requested.

The specification has been amended as indicated above in order to make a minor clarification which will be explained in more detail below. However, it is submitted that this clarification does not constitute new matter, and the Examiner is respectfully requested to enter the amendment to the specification.

The Examiner rejected pending claims 15-34 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. Specifically, the Examiner asserted that the original disclosure does not sufficiently support the subject matter recited in pending claims 15-34. However, these rejections are traversed and, for the reasons discussed below, it is respectfully submitted that the pending claims are fully supported by the original disclosure.

In the outstanding Office Action, the Examiner noted that independent claims 15 and 27 referred to a "transmission data determining unit for determining, from among the generated data stored in said generated data storage unit, the transmission data to be transmitted to the server." The Examiner also noted that the original disclosure only contained a single mention of a "transmission data determining unit" in the original specification, and that single mention occurred on page 5, line 22 of the original specification. In this regard, the Examiner quoted a portion of the original specification describing the transmission data determining unit, and asserted that the original disclosure did not state that the transmission data determining unit makes its determination from amongst generated data stored in a generated data storing unit.

As an initial matter, it is noted that the Examiner did not quote the entire relevant passage from page 5 of the original specification. Specifically, this passage explains that the transmission data determining unit determines the transmission data to be transmitted to the server *"from among the generated data."* Thus, although this section of the original specification does not specifically explain that the generated data is stored in a generated data storing unit, this section <u>does</u> support the feature that the transmission data determining unit makes its determination from among generated data.

- 8 -

Secondly, although the Applicants do not disagree with the Examiner that there is only a single occurrence of the phrase "transmission data determining unit" in the original specification, the Applicants submit that the subject matter of all of the pending claims is nonetheless fully supported by the original disclosure. In this regard, it is first noted that the "transmission data *generating* unit 44," appearing in FIG. 4 and described in detail on page 18, paragraph [0049] through page 28, paragraph [0074] of the original specification, corresponds to the "transmission data *determining* unit" recited in independent claims 15 and 27 and appearing on page 5 of the original specification. Therefore, in order to provide antecedent basis for the claim language, independent claims 15 and 27 have now been amended as indicated above to change the phrase "transmission data *determining* unit" to "transmission data *generating* unit," and page 5 of the original specification (corresponding to line 2 of page 5 of the substitute specification filed July 2, 2004) has also been amended to change "transmission data determining unit" to "transmission data generating unit."

Although the Examiner's attention is directed to the entire explanation of the present invention as presented in the original specification (and, in particular, the detailed explanation of one embodiment of the present invention as presented on pages 18-28 of the original specification) for a complete and thorough understanding of the present invention, an explanation of the support for the present invention will now be provided with reference to specific portions of the specification. Of course, reference to any particular embodiments is provided only for the Examiner's benefit, and is not intended to otherwise limit the scope of the claims.

As explained in paragraph [0063] of the original specification, an application executing unit 42 executes an application 131, and data generated during execution of the application 131 is sent for storage in the generated data storage unit 43. Subsequently, as explained in paragraph [0070], the transmission data generating unit 44 determines the transmission data from among the generated data stored in the generated data storage unit 43. Then, as explained in paragraph [0073], the transmission data generated (i.e., determined from among the generated data stored in the generated data storage unit) is transmitted to a server 3.

It is submitted that the detailed explanation of one embodiment of the present invention as set forth on pages 18-28 of the original specification fully supports the invention recited in all of the pending claims 15-34. As a result, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the rejection under § 112, first paragraph, as set forth in the outstanding Office Action. Furthermore, it is submitted that all of the pending claims are clearly patentable over the prior art of record.

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is submitted that the present application is now in condition for allowance. However, if the Examiner should have any comments or suggestions to help speed the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is requested to contact the Applicant's undersigned representative.

Respectfully submitted,

Satoshi INAMI, et al.

By:_____

W. Douglas Hahm
Registration No. 44,142
Attorney for Applicants

WDH/ck
Washington, D.C. 20006-1021
Telephone (202) 721-8200
Facsimile (202) 721-8250
March 3, 2006

- 10 -